DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 443 PS 008 853

AUTHOR Mergendoller, John R.
TITLE Compensatory Education and the Varieties of Intervention: A Program Element Typology Based on the Model of the Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO NIE-P-76-0008
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 109p.; Filmed from best available copy

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change; Community Role; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Early Childhood Education; Formative Evaluation; Grouping (Instructional Purposes); *Intervention; Learning Activities; Learning Processes; Objectives; Open Education; Parent Role; Preschool Children; Preschool Curriculum; Preschool Teachers; *Program Descriptions; *Program Design; Program Evaluation; Staff Role; Teaching Methods; Time Blocks; *Typology
IDENTIFIERS Planned Variation; *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This document presents a descriptive typology created to characterize the diverse program approaches of the Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment. Program approaches are described with respect to two orthogonal dimensions: (1) Program Elements (Instructional, Service, Participatory and Employment) with the major focus on instructional elements including curricular orientation (learning emphasis and instructional role); curricular design (nature and uniformity of activities, time utilization, instructional grouping); curricular responsibility (pre- and post-instructional); and curricular variability (instructional activities, time utilization, and instructional grouping); and (2) Target Population (Children, Instructors and Parents). To demonstrate the use of this typology, five Follow Through Planned Variation program approaches are described using the previously developed program descriptors. (Author/MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129443

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION AND THE VARIETIES OF INTERVENTION: A PROGRAM ELEMENT TYPOLOGY BASED ON THE MODEL OF THE FOLLOW THROUGH PLANNED VARIATION EXPERIMENT

by
John R. Mergendoller

This document was completed pursuant to Purchase Order #NIE-P-76-0008 for the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government.

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of any federal agency.

PS 008853

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Loren Barritt for his suggestions regarding an earlier draft of this paper, Melvin Shelley for his wit and ideas, and Gene Ramp and Gail Sharfman for their information concerning the program approaches designed by the Department of Human Development at The University of Kansas and the Educational Development Center.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROGRAM ELEMENT TYPOLOGY	1
I. DEFINITIONS AND ORGANIZING PRINCIPLES	5
Condensed Program Element Typology	
II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTORS	14
Complete Program Element Typology	
Program Elements Directed Toward Children	
Program Elements Directed Toward Instructors	
Program Elements Directed Toward Parents	
III. EXAMPLES OF THE USE OF THE PROGRAM ELEMENT TYPOLOGY	85
AFRAM Parent Implementation Approach	
Behavior Analysis Approach	
Cognitively Oriented Curriculum Approach	
EDC Open Education Program	
Florida Parent Education Model	
FOOTNOTES	99

The Program Element Typology:

Introduction

Introduction

The focus of compensatory education programs like Follow Through has been a broad one. Attention has been paid to the physical and emotional well-being of the child, to the home environment and the parent-child interaction, to the development of a cohesive community organization concerned with school governance and community problems and, finally, to the child's classroom experience within school. Such a broad focus is in accord with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which authorized the creation of the Head Start and the Follow Through intervention programs. Regarding Follow Through, this legislation states:

> . . . "Follow Through" [will] be designed to provide comprehensive [health, nutritional, education and social] services and parent participation activities which the director finds will aid in the continuing development of children to their full potential.[1]

The charge of this legislation is to improve the overall life experience of children, or to encourage the "development of children to their full potential." Two crucial questions accompany this charge, however. First, one might ask, how is the "full potential" of children to be defined? There is no agreement among educators, psychologists and parents concerning the qualities which are the most important in the facilitation of optimal development.

The second question is equally complex. Why have children not been able to reach their full potential in the past? Had we agreement concerning the reasons for this deficiency, we would know how to begin to approach its remediation.

We do not have the answers to these questions, however, and thus are left with an ill-defined problem to be remediated for which there is no agreed upon criterion of success. Let us turn to a medical analogy to clarify this point. Suppose a disease becomes the focus of public attention, and the symptoms of this disease are vague and numerous. Various theories are presented by medical authorities concerning the etiology of the disease, but there is no consensus concerning its causation. To make matters worse, there is no general agreement as to when the deleterious effects of the disease are actually alleviated, for different authorities propose different definitions of health and propose to measure the restored health of the patient in diverse ways. However problematical those theoretical disputes, the disease is raging, and it is felt that action must be taken. Various medical researchers are then asked, on the basis of their best guesses and theoretical knowledge, to develop drugs which will be effective against the disease. The drugs are produced and tested, and some of the drugs appear to be more effective in the alleviation of certain symptoms than others. The first question to be posed by the evaluator is, naturally, which potion proves to be the best drug? The question is

perplexing and probably impossible to answer since the drugs have different constellations of effects, and no agreement has been made concerning the most important symptom to be alleviated. Debate ensues. Attention is focused on the mixture of chemical compounds which make up each drug, but it is found that different drug manufacturers have used different names for compounds which appear to be quite similar. Confusion multiplies. It becomes evident that in order to analyze the composition of various drugs and their resultant effects, a common vocabulary must be created to allow the composition of the various drugs to be compared. Such a common vocabulary will serve as the first step toward the evaluation of the effectiveness of the chemical elements which make up each drug, and help to resolve the confusion which surrounds their composition.

This medical analogy suggests the purpose of the present monograph. This paper seeks to create a common vocabulary which can be used to identify and describe the diversity of program elements which make up the various program approaches of the Follow Through Planned Intervention Experiment. Although based upon the program approaches of Follow Through, care has been taken to create program descriptors of sufficient depth and breadth so that they may be used to describe future intervention efforts as well as current Follow Through programs.

This paper is divided into three parts. In the first part, the rationale for the principles employed to

organize the Program Element Typology are discussed. The second part of the paper introduces the Program Element Typology and explains the program descriptors which characterize the intervention approaches. The final part of this paper presents examples of the use of this typology with five of the major intervention approaches implemented in the Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment.

I. The Program Element Typology: Definitions and Organizing Principles

The Program Element Typology: Definitions and Organizing Principles

Since this paper seeks to clarify the confusion which surrounds the definition of the elements of the various sponsors' approaches to Follow Through, it is judicious to avoid additional confusion and turn immediately to a definition of terms. The expressions, intervention, program approach, program elements, and program descriptors, are used throughout the rest of this paper and merit explanation. An intervention is any attempt to intervene in an ongoing social system in order to effect change in that system or in the lives of the individuals who make up that system. Program approach refers to the distinctive intervention design created by each Follow Through sponsor in an attempt to "aid the continuing development of children to their full potential." The program approach represents the sum total of each sponsor's intervention effort, and may be concerned with instruction, the provision of health and nutritional services or community organization. The expression, program approach, has been chosen instead of "program," because it is felt that "program approach" suggests that there exist various approaches to the fulfillment of the goal of the Follow Through Planned Variation program. Given this connotation, the nationwide Follow Through program is considered to encompass a variety of program approaches.

A program approach is composed of program elements. Program elements are the discrete parts of an intervention

package which have different foci in the overall program approach. In Follow Through, there are four types of program elements: (1) Instructional Elements; (2) Service Elements; (3) Participatory Elements; and (4) Employment Elements. The specific characteristics of these elements, which will be enumerated as the paper progresses, are defined by program descriptors. It is at the level of the program descriptors that the diverse program approaches to Follow Through can be differentiated. Program descriptors are smaller descriptive units employed to characterize program approaches. It is the goal of the Program Element Typology to facilitate the delineation of diverse program approaches using the common vocabulary and concepts of the program descriptors. These descriptors will be examined and defined in the next section of this paper.

Moving away from terminology, we turn to the task of bringing order to the rich complexity of the Follow Through program approaches. The breadth and diversity of these program approaches has been noted in the preceding section of this paper. Follow Through interventions attempt to affect the classroom experience of children as well as their interactions with parents. Follow Through seeks to train teachers in new and diverse ways of teaching. In addition, parents are encouraged to take an active part in the governance of their school and community as well as employed to help with the implementation of the program approach.

These diverse goals, and the means by which they are pursued, can be characterized in various ways. This paper has selected two dimensions to serve as organizers for the Program Element Typology. The first dimension concerns the population toward which the intervention is directed. The second dimension concerns the focus of the intervention in relationship to the selected population. Let us consider these dimensions more fully.

After perusing the various program approaches of the Follow Through intervention program, three populations have been identified as being primarily affected by program. These populations are, naturally: (1) Children; (2) Instructors; and (3) Parents. Although it is assumed that an intervention which affects children may in some manner indirectly affect their parents, and similarly, an intervention which affects teachers may also have an impact on the children whom they instruct, for the purposes of this typology, attention is concentrated only upon the direct impact of the intervention program on each population. The potential ripple effect of an intervention is ignored in order to facilitate a more parsimonious depiction of the target of interventions. The first dimension of target population allows the characterization of program approaches according to the group of individuals toward which the intervention is aimed. Although these groups may overlap, as in the case where the home-based instructors are the parents, in the interests of simplicity and clarity, these

target populations are considered independently of one another. Thus a parent who functions as an instructor will be seen as having two independent roles and belonging to two target populations.

The second dimension of the Program Element Typology is concerned with the program elements which define the foci of an intervention. The program elements specify the general nature of the intervention treatment. Through a consideration of the program elements, the immediate purposes of the program approach become apparent. Let us turn to Figure 1, the Condensed Program Element Typology, and examine the heuristic taxonomy which results from the interaction of the dimensions of target population and program elements.

TARGET POPULATION

1 Children

PROGRAM ELEMENTS

- 1.1 Instructional Element
  - 1.1.1 Curricular Orientation
    - 1.1.1.1 Learning Emphasis
    - 1.1.1.2 Instructional Role
    - 1.1.1.3 Locus of Reinforcement
  - 1.1.2 Curricular Design
    - 1.1.2.1 Activities
    - 1.1.2.2 Time Utilization
    - 1.1.2.3 Instructional Grouping
  - 1.1.3 Curricular Responsibility
    - 1.1.3.1 Pre-Instructional
    - 1.1.3.2 Instructional
    - 1.1.3.3 Post-Instructional
  - 1.1.4 Curricular Variability
    - 1.1.4.1 Instructional Activities
    - 1.1.4.2 Time Utilization
    - 1.1.4.3 Instructional Grouping
  - 1.1.5 No Instructional Element
- 1.2 Service Element
  - 1.2.1 Medical
  - 1.2.2 Dental
  - 1.2.3 Psychological
  - 1.2.4 Health and Nutrition
  - 1.2.5 No Service Element

Fig. 1. Condensed Program Element Typology (Part 1)

PROGRAM ELEMENTS

TARGET POPULATION

2 Instructors

- 2.1 Instructional Element
  - 2.1.1 Overall Orientation
  - 2.1.2 Means of Instruction
  - 2.1.3 Responsibility for Planning and Facilitating Instruction
  - 2.1.4 Formative Evaluation
    - 2.1.4.1 Self-Evaluation
    - 2.1.4.2 Evaluation by Others
  - 2.1.5 No Instructional Element

3 Parents

- 3.1 Instructional Element
  - 3.1.1 Primary Orientation
  - 3.1.2 No Instructional Element
- 3.2 Participatory Element (Unsalaried)
  - 3.2.1 Primary Orientation
  - 3.2.2 No Participatory Element
- 3.3 Employment Element
  - 3.3.1 Primary Orientation
  - 3.3.2 No Employment Element

Fig. 1. Condensed Program Element Typology (Parts 2 and 3)

In Figure 1, the three target populations are displayed horizontally along the top edge of the pages (once the page has been rotated 90 degrees). The program elements which define the nature of the program approach are displayed vertically under each target population. Thus when considering the target population of children, we find there are two sorts of program elements, an Instructional Element and a Service Element, which are present in the Follow Through Planned Intervention experiment. Turning to the target population of instructors, a category which encompasses teachers, teachers' aids, parents, or any individual charged with the instruction of the target population of children, we find that the Follow Through intervention directed toward this group have been purely instructional in nature. Looking finally at the target population of parents, it is evident that three types of program elements have been utilized in various program approaches. These program elements are focused on instructing the parents, encouraging their participation in the sponsor's program approach, or providing employment for the parents.

A consideration of the four categories of program elements, instruction, provision of services, participation and employment, as well as a consideration of the relevant target populations toward which they are focused provides a broad overview of the activities which make up the Follow Through Planned Intervention experiment. Although such a coarse-grained depiction of Follow Through is useful

when considering its overall breadth and focus, such a description does not allow for very subtle differentiation between the diverse program approaches which use different means to reach the same goals. For example, the instruction of children is an element which appears in the program approaches of many sponsors, but there are strikingly different ways in which this element can be operationalized. The commonality and variety of each program approach is revealed by considering the next sub-categories of the Program Element Typology, the Program Descriptors.

Consider, for example, the various instructional curricula which have been employed in Follow Through instructional interventions. It is believed that these curricula -- as well as most other curricula -- can be characterized in terms of four program descriptors: (1) Curricular Orientation; (2) Curricular Design; (3) Curricular Responsibility; and (4) Curricular Variability. (A fifth descriptor, No Instructional Element, is a null category which indicates that there is no specific instructional intervention directed toward children.) In other words, it is maintained that all curricula demonstrate an overall orientation, that they manifest certain design principles, that they allocate responsibility in definite ways, and finally, that they show varying degrees of consistency and variability. By examining different curricula according to these four program descriptors, a useful characterization of the curricula can be developed.

Although we have examined the program descriptors which define the different approaches to the instruction of children, the same logic surrounds the generation of program descriptors to distinguish the instructional interventions directed toward instructors as well as the instructional, participatory and employment interventions focused on parents.

In the Follow Through Planned Variation experiment, however, the heart of the variation -- and, indeed, the intervention -- has been the instructional element. The service and participatory program elements have not been the subject of systematic variation, while widely divergent instructional approaches have been encouraged.[2] The major focus of the Program Element Typology is on the Instructional Elements. The program descriptors which delineate the instructional elements of program approaches are multi-dimensional units with a coherent theoretical focus. They encompass several distinct foci which partition the program descriptors in various ways. Looking, for example, at the program descriptor of Curricular Orientation under the target population of Children, we see that it can be subdivided into Learning Emphasis, Instructional Model and Locus of Reinforcement. It is assumed that the underlying orientation of a curriculum is revealed by examining how it is defined in these areas. The overall program descriptor of curricular orientation is the multi-dimensional aggregation of these sub-foci.

It should be noted that just as the education of children is not a simple, unidimensional endeavor, the program descriptors are not simple, unidimensional concepts. Although the program descriptors share a unified conceptual focus, this focus is a necessarily complex one. To simplify the focus into an uncomplicated and primitive depiction of the curricula would greatly weaken the ability of this typology to discriminate the subtleties which distinguish curricula. Even with the complex descriptors which make up the Complete Program Element Typology, it may be argued that any attempt to reduce an ongoing, interactive process of instruction -- or service delivery or employment -- to a limited set of descriptive categories must ignore much of the richness of the process. Although this argument is valid (and inescapable), what is sought in this treatment of the Follow Through program approaches is a balance between descriptive adequacy and descriptive economy. The price of an economical description of program approaches is a coarse-grained depiction of these approaches. Even with the complexity of the Program Element Typology which is presented in Figure 2, it is inescapable that force-fitting will be necessary to account for all program approach variations. Nevertheless, these imperfections must be tolerated unless the number of program descriptors is to expand to an unusable number. With this caveat in mind, we turn to an examination of the complete Program Element Typology.

II. The Program Element Typology: Program Descriptors

Fig. 2. Complete Program Element Typology

1 Children

1.1 Instructional Element

1.1.1 Curricular Orientation

1.1.1.1 Learning Emphasis

1.1.1.1.1 Process Emphasis. Orientation Toward Learning as a Complex, Multi-dimensional, Interactive Cognitive and Emotional Process. Concentration on the skills of problem solving with attention to the feelings and self-perceptions of "the whole child." Criterion of task accomplishment often unexplicit.

1.1.1.1.2 Performance Emphasis. Orientation Toward the Performance of social and cognitive behaviors. Concentration on the production of correct responses with less attention to the feelings and self-perceptions of the child. Emphasis on the "presenting behavior." Criteria of task accomplishment behaviorally specified.

1.1.1.1.3 Mixed Emphasis. Elements of both orientations. No Dominant Focus.

1.1.1.2 Instructional Role

1.1.1.2.1 Interpretive Role. Instructor uses judgment to respond to the child on the basis of principles outlined by the sponsor. Instructor's behavior not specified in advance.

1.1.1.2.2 Regulated Role. Instructor responds to child with behaviors specified in advance by the sponsor.

1.1.1.2.3 Mixed Role. Elements of both orientations. No Dominant Focus.

1.1.1.3 Locus of Reinforcement

1.1.1.3.1 Instructional Activity

1.1.1.3.2 Instructors

1.1.1.3.3 Peers

1.1.1.3.4 Instructional Activity and Instructors

1.1.1.3.5 Instructional Activity and Peers

1.1.1.3.6 Instructors and Peers

1.1.1.3.7 Instructional Activity, Instructors and Peers

1.1.2 Curricular Design

1.1.2.1 Activities

1.1.2.1.1 Nature of Activities

1.1.2.1.1.1 Manipulative-Exploratory. Concentration on the facilitation of the child's exploration of the environment and the physical manipulation of objects. Activities and materials vary a great deal. Utilization of the materials in diverse ways is encouraged.

1.1.2.1.1.2 Productive-Responsive. Concentration on the facilitation of specified responses. Activities and materials structured and uniform. Production of the desired behavior is encouraged.

1.1.2.1.1.3 Mixed Orientation. Elements of both approaches. No Dominant Emphasis.

1.1.2.1.2 Uniformity of Activities

1.1.2.1.2.1 Diverse. Children pursue different activities during the Instructional Period.

1.1.2.1.2.2 Identical. Children pursue the same activity during the Instructional Period.

1.1.2.1.2.3 Mixed Orientation. Elements of both approaches. No Dominant Emphasis.

1.1.2.2 Time Utilization

1.1.2.2.1 Diffuse. No specific subjects singled out for emphasis. Attention broadly focused on wide range of possible learning activities.

1.1.2.2.2 Concentrated. Intensive attention to specific subjects such as reading, mathematics, handwriting. Minimum daily time allocation for these areas may be specified by the sponsor.

1.1.2.2.3 Mixed Orientation. Elements of both approaches. No Dominant Focus.

1.1.2.3 Instructional Grouping

1.1.2.3.1 Variability

1.1.2.3.1.1 Heterogeneous with regard to:

1.1.2.3.1.1.1 Age

1.1.2.3.1.1.2 Sex

1.1.2.3.1.1.3 Developmental or Performance Level

1.1.2.3.1.2 Homogeneous with regard to:

1.1.2.3.1.2.1 Age

1.1.2.3.1.2.2 Sex

1.1.2.3.1.2.3 Developmental or Performance Level

1.1.2.3.2 Size

1.1.2.3.2.1 Child Works Alone (1 Child)

1.1.2.3.2.2 Small Groups (2-6 Children)

1.1.2.3.2.3 Large Groups (7-15 Children)

1.1.2.3.2.4 Entire Class (All Children)

1.1.2.3.2.5 Alone and Small Groups

1.1.2.3.2.6 Alone and Large Groups

1.1.2.3.2.7 Alone and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.8 Small Groups and Large Groups

1.1.2.3.2.9 Small Groups and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.10 Large Groups and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.11 Alone, Small Groups and Large Groups

1.1.2.3.2.12 Alone, Large Groups and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.13 Alone, Small Groups and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.14 Alone, Small Groups, Large Groups and Entire Class

1.1.3 Curricular Responsibility

1.1.3.1 Pre-Instructional

1.1.3.1.1 Generation or Specification of Instructional Materials

1.1.3.1.1.1 Sponsor

1.1.3.1.1.2 Instructors

1.1.3.1.1.3 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.1.2 Generation or Specification of Instructional Activities

1.1.3.1.2.1 Sponsor

1.1.3.1.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.1.2.3 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.2 Instructional

1.1.3.2.1 Maintenance of Instructional Interaction

1.1.3.2.1.1 School-based Instructor

1.1.3.2.1.2 Home-based Parent

1.1.3.2.1.3 School-based Instructor and Home-based Parent

1.1.3.2.2 Activity Selection by:

1.1.3.2.2.1 Child

1.1.3.2.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.2.2.3 Child and Instructors

1.1.3.3 Post Instructional

1.1.3.3.1 Formative Evaluation by:

1.1.3.3.1.1 Child

1.1.3.3.1.2 Instructors

1.1.3.3.1.3 Sponsor

1.1.3.3.1.4 Child and Instructors

1.1.3.3.1.5 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.3.1.6 Does not apply. No Formative Evaluation Conducted.

1.1.3.3.2 Instructional Prescription by:

1.1.3.3.2.1 Child

1.1.3.3.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.3.2.3 Sponsor

1.1.3.3.2.4 Child and Instructors

1.1.3.3.2.5 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.3.2.6 Does not apply. No Instructional Prescription Made

1.1.4 Curricular Variability

1.1.4.1 Instructional Activities

1.1.4.1.1 Change Daily

1.1.4.1.2 Change Weekly

1.1.4.1.3 Change Monthly

1.1.4.1.4 Change Yearly

1.1.4.1.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.1.4.1.6 Do Not Change

1.1.4.2 Time Utilization

1.1.4.2.1 Changes Daily

1.1.4.2.2 Changes Weekly

1.1.4.2.3 Changes Monthly

1.1.4.2.4 Changes Yearly

1.1.4.2.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.1.4.2.6 Does Not Change

1.1.4.3 Instructional Grouping

1.1.4.3.1 Changes Daily

1.1.4.3.2 Changes Weekly

1.1.4.3.3 Changes Monthly

1.1.4.3.4 Changes Yearly

1.1.4.3.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.1.4.3.6 Does Not Change

1.1.5 No Instructional Element

1.2 Service Element

1.2.1 Medical

1.2.1.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.2 Dental

1.2.2.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.3 Psychological

1.2.3.1 Preventive. Advise Instructional Personnel

1.2.3.2 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.3.3 Preventive as well as Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.4 Health and Nutrition

1.2.4.1 Educational Program

1.2.4.2 Meal Program

1.2.4.3 Educational and Meal Program

1.2.5 No Service Element

2 Instructors

2.1 Instructional Element

2.1.1 Overall Orientation

2.1.1.1 Encouragement of Individual Personal Development

2.1.1.2 Familiarization with Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor

2.1.1.3 Internalization of Behaviorally Specified Responses to Instructional Contingencies

2.1.1.4 Encouragement of Individual Personal Development and Familiarization with Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor

2.1.1.5 Familiarization with Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor and Internalization of Behaviorally Specified Responses to Instructional Contingencies

2.1.2 Means of Instruction

- 2.1.2.1 Demonstration Classroom
- 2.1.2.2 Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results
- 2.1.2.3 Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising
- 2.1.2.4 Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods
- 2.1.2.5 Demonstration Classroom + Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results
- 2.1.2.6 Demonstration Classroom + Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising
- 2.1.2.7 Demonstration Classroom + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods
- 2.1.2.8 Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods
- 2.1.2.9 Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods
- 2.1.2.10 Demonstration Classroom + Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods
- 2.1.2.11 Demonstration Classroom + Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

2.1.3 Responsibility for Planning and Facilitating Instruction

- 2.1.3.1 Sponsor
- 2.1.3.2 Instructors
- 2.1.3.3 Sponsor and Instructors

2.1.4 Formative Evaluation

- 2.1.4.1 Self-Evaluation
  - 2.1.4.1.1 Based on Instructor's Perceptions of Classroom Interaction
  - 2.1.4.1.2 Based on Implementation Criteria

2.1.4.1.3 No Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.2 Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.1 Evaluators

2.1.4.2.1.1 Sponsor (or Sponsor's Representative)

2.1.4.2.1.2 Peer Instructors

2.1.4.2.1.3 Sponsor and Peer Instructors

2.1.4.2.1.4 No Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.2 Means of Evaluation

2.1.4.2.2.1 Directed Observation

2.1.4.2.2.2 Assessment of Children's Progress

2.1.4.2.2.3 Directed Observation and Assessment of Children's Progress

2.1.5 No Instructional Element

3 Parents

3.1 Instructional Element

3.1.1 Primary Focus

3.1.1.1 Concentration on the Parent-Child Interaction

3.1.1.2 Familiarization with Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor's Curriculum

3.1.1.3 Concentration on Social Change and Community Action Skills

3.1.1.4 Concentration on Principles of Budgeting, Nutrition and Health Care

3.1.1.5 Concentration on the Parent-Child Interaction and Social Change and Community Action Skills

3.1.1.6 Familiarization with Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor's Curriculum and Social Change and Community Action Skills

3.1.1.7 Familiarization with Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor's Curriculum and Principles of Budgeting, Nutrition and Health Care

3.1.1.8 Concentration on Social Change and Community Action Skills and Principles of Budgeting, Nutrition and Health Care

3.1.2 No Instructional Element

3.2 Participatory Element (Unsalaried)

3.2.1 Primary Focus

3.2.1.1 Community Organization and School Governance

3.2.1.2 Instructional Assistants

3.2.1.3 Community Organization and School Governance as well as Instructional Assistants

3.2.2 No Participatory Element

3.3 Employment Element

3.3.1 Primary Focus

3.3.1.1 Instructional

3.3.1.2 Administrative

3.3.1.3 School-Community Liaison

3.3.1.4 Community Organization

3.3.1.5 Instructional and Administrative

3.3.1.6 Instructional and School-Community Liaison

3.3.1.7 Instructional, Administrative and School-Community Liaison

3.3.2 No Employment Element

3.3 Employment Element

- 3.3.1 Primary Focus
  - 3.3.1.1 Instructional
  - 3.3.1.2 Administrative
  - 3.3.1.3 School-Community Liaison
  - 3.3.1.4 Community Organization
  - 3.3.1.5 Instructional and Administrative
  - 3.3.1.6 Instructional and School-Community Liaison
  - 3.3.1.7 Instructional, Administrative and School-Community Liaison
- 3.3.2 No Employment Element

The Program Element Typology II: Program Descriptors

Figure 2 presents the complete Program Element Typology. The purpose of this section of the paper is to examine the rationale for the selection of each program descriptor and then to define each descriptor and sub-descriptor so that they may be used to characterize the Follow Through program approaches. Accordingly, this section may be considered a commentary on the complete Program Element Typology.

Following the order established in the Program Element Typology, we will first consider the instructional program element which is directed toward the population of children. Once this category has been examined, we will turn to the service element directed toward the same population. The program elements which affect the populations of instructors and parents will be considered in turn until the entire Program Element Typology has been surveyed.

Program Elements Directed Toward Children

Instructional Program Element Directed Toward Children

Program Descriptor: 1.1.1 Curricular Orientation

In general, the Program Element Typology concentrates on the readily observable parts of an instructional curriculum. It is felt that distinctions can best be made between curricula on the basis of what can be observed rather than what is espoused by the curriculum sponsor. But an emphasis on directly observable data is superficial

unless there is some attention to the intent and the general theoretical orientation of the sponsor. Curricula are created according to the ideas, assumptions and theories of the curriculum builder. These basic assumptions will guide decisions concerning different facets of the curriculum. The assumptions of the curriculum builder stamp the curriculum with a specific orientation.

In the educational literature, various rubrics have been used to describe general theoretical orientations, and to classify instructional approaches on the basis of these rubrics. The most common distinction is that of developmental and behavioral theoretical orientations. Most curricular innovations in Follow Through and elsewhere can be seen as having their theoretical roots in these schools of thought. To label a curricular orientation as behavioristic or developmental, however, is to use a very gross and potentially misleading nomenclature for a curriculum which may create its own distinctive admixture of both theoretical approaches. Rather than resort to a gross categorization of curriculum orientation as developmental or behavioristic, a more useful approach is to note how the orientation of curricula differ in three basic areas:

(1) the Learning Emphasis which is the focus of the curriculum;

(2) the Instructional model which is utilized; and

(3) the Locus of Reinforcement which is assumed to exist.

Let us take a closer look at each of these distinguishing categories.

1.1.1.1 Learning Emphasis

There are three distinct emphases which can be given to the act of learning: (1) a process emphasis; (2) a performance emphasis; and (3) a mixed emphasis.

When the process of learning is emphasized, attention is directed to encouraging the child to be involved in this learning process, and less attention is given to the specific learning outcomes. A basic goal of this orientation is to encourage the child to engage in learning activities unassisted and to remain involved with the learning activities. An often quoted maxim of this learning orientation is that the child must "learn how to learn." It is assumed that once a child becomes familiar with and enticed by the process of learning, then the child will desire to continue to learn, and important learning outcomes will be facilitated by this self-generated process involvement.

A process emphasis suggests the curriculum must help a child to learn the skills of problem solving so that these skills may be applied to many different areas. In this manner, if the child gains competency in the learning process, then performance in the academic domain will follow naturally.

Another assumption which generally is part of the

process emphasis to learning is a belief that learning is a complex, multi-dimensional, internal process which is governed by the child and which involves emotions and self-perceptions as well as cognitive skills. The complexity of this process must be recognized and dealt with, and thus to encourage learning is to facilitate the multi-dimensional growth of the whole child, rather than to teach in the narrowly defined realm of expected academic competencies. These academic competencies are respected, but it is believed that they will result from the child's intense involvement with the overall process of learning, rather than from the specific emphasis of academic skills.

Because the process emphasis to learning focuses on the child's ongoing involvement with instructional materials rather than on the results of that involvement, criteria of adequate process involvement or of the occurance of sufficient learning outcome are often difficult to operationalize in an explicit and unequivocal manner. Since it is assumed that learning is complex and multi-dimensional, the acceptance of simplified, clear-cut criteria for that learning is difficult.

An orientation to learning which emphasizes performance suggests a distinctly different conception of the learning act. What is in question here is not the murky complexities of the multi-dimensional process of learning, but the elements of the learning act which can be observed, quantified and made explicit. A performance

emphasis does not raise the question of the ultimate, internal, irreducible nature of learning, but instead, focuses on the parts of learning which are accessible to measurement, the performance of the child on defined learning tasks. Curricula which demonstrate a performance emphasis do not neglect the emotional aspects of children's development, they merely assume that healthy emotional development will be facilitated by the satisfaction of learning to perform relevant cognitive and social tasks. This orientation then assumes that concern for the child can best be shown by teaching the child to perform well on school-relevant specified tasks. Because the performance of specific behaviors is sought, the criterion of task accomplishment can be clearly specified in this learning orientation.

It must be noted that the responsibility for this characterization of process and performance learning emphases belongs to the author. The narrative descriptions of these emphases are short, and perhaps inadequate in presenting all of the differences and subtleties which separate these orientations. Again, we find a necessary compromise between descriptive adequacy and descriptive economy. It is hoped, however, that these descriptions convey a general notion of two sorts of emphasis which can be given to the learning act. It is not suggested that one orientation is inherently superior to the other orientation. It is suggested, however, that these orientations differ

in the emphasis they place on the learning act, and the subsequent orientation which is found in the curricula which embody these different learning emphases.

The third category of learning orientation, mixed emphasis, suggests the combination of processes and performance emphases and denotes the admixture of the approaches with neither approach dominant. This third category allows for the creative synthesis of the above orientations. The characteristics of a mixed emphasis to the learning act can be constructed by referring back to the descriptions of process and performance orientations delineated above.

In an effort to summarize the above discussion of learning emphases, the abbreviated definitions of the three orientations which appear on the complete Program Element Typology are noted below.

1.1.1.1.1 Process Emphasis. Orientation Toward Learning as a Complex, Multi-dimensional, Interactive Cognitive and Emotional Process. Concentration on the skills of problem solving with attention to the feelings and self-perceptions of "the whole child." Criterion of task accomplishment often unexplicit.

1.1.1.1.2 Performance Emphasis. Orientation Toward the Performance of social and cognitive behaviors. Concentration on the production of correct responses with less attention to the feelings and self-perceptions of the child. Emphasis on the "presenting behavior." Criteria of task accomplishment behaviorally specified.

1.1.1.1.3 Mixed Emphasis. Elements of both orientations. No Dominant Focus.

1.1.1.2 Instructional Role

The concept, instructional role, expresses the generalized expectations which are held for the nature of the instructors' responses to the child during the instructional period. There are three types of instructional roles: (1) Interpretive; (2) Regulated; and (3) Mixed.

The Interpretive instructional role relies on the instructor to make autonomous decisions regarding the proper responses to be made to the child throughout the instructional period. The instructor is assumed to be familiar with the theories and principles of the curricular designer, but uses individual judgment in the operationalization of these concepts. With the interpretive instructional role, correct responses to instructional contingencies cannot be fully specified in advance since the optimum response relies on the judicious judgment of the instructor. Different children may require distinctly different treatment, and it is felt that the instructor can best decide on the spot the appropriate course of action.

The regulated instructional role gives less autonomy to the teacher to make decisions regarding the optimum response to instructional contingencies. Certain instructionally-appropriate behaviors are specified in advance, and it is the responsibility of the instructor to respond to the child with these carefully defined behaviors. The regulated instructional role requires that consistent well-defined procedures be used in dealing with children, and

thus there is little room for intuition or spur-of-the-moment decisions.

The mixed orientation demonstrates, naturally, elements of both of the previous instructional roles. Instructional responses, for example, may be carefully specified in some curricular areas, while other areas are left to the judgment and intuition of the instructor. In the mixed orientation, the instructor fulfills no dominant instructional role.

In an effort to summarize the above discussion of instructional role, the abbreviated definitions of the three orientations which appear on the complete program Typology are noted below.

1.1.1.2.1 Interpretive Role. Instructor uses judgment to respond to the child on the basis of principles outlined by the sponsor. Instructor's behavior not specified in advance.

1.1.1.2.2 Regulated Role. Instructor responds to child with behaviors specified in advance by the sponsor.

1.1.1.2.3 Mixed Role. Elements of both orientations. No Dominant Focus.

1.1.1.3 Locus of Reinforcement

For the heuristic purposes of this paper, reinforcement is considered to be the elusive quality which maintains the participation of children in task-activities. Reinforcement, in effect, is seen as the payoff for instructional involvement. The locus of reinforcement indicates the source from which the reinforcement derives,

and denotes the agents or the activities which are expected to be reinforcing -- during the instructional period. There are three primary loci of reinforcement: (1) Instructional Activity; (2) Instructors; and (3) Peers. These loci can be combined in various ways.

When the locus of reinforcement is located within the instructional activity itself, then it is the pleasure, interest and discoveries inherent in participation in the learning activity which sustain the child's involvement. In this case, a child participates in the learning task "because it is fun" or is in some way rewarding. Such activities are often said to be intrinsically reinforcing to the child. Many Follow Through and other curricula strive to create instructional activities for which the act of participation not only provokes learning, but at the same time reinforces the child. In this manner, participation becomes its own reward.

Another approach to maintaining the child's interest and participation in a learning activity is to make the instructor the reinforcing agent and hence, the locus of reinforcement. In this case, the instructor dispenses praise, tokens, privileges and the like to children when they are behaving appropriately. Unlike a curriculum where reinforcement is found merely in the act of participation, a curriculum which makes the instructor the reinforcing agent gains control over when reinforcement will and will not occur. In this manner, the instructor can reinforce

behavior which is thought to be worthwhile and productive of desired learning outcomes and not reinforce (or ignore) behavior which is unproductive.

The third locus where reinforcement can be sought is from the other children in the classroom. Some curricula encourage peer reinforcement in order to reduce the dependency of the individual child on the instructor. It is also argued that peer reinforcement encourages independence of thought, cooperation, mutual respect and feelings of community. Like the reinforcement which is found in learning activities, however, peer reinforcement cannot be readily controled by the instructor.

When considering the locus of reinforcement prevalent in a curriculum, it is not assumed that all reinforcement will be derived from the same locus to the complete exclusion of all other loci. This is clearly impossible. Even in a curriculum which strives to make participation in activities an intrinsically reinforcing experience, the occasional word or smile from the teacher will provide reinforcement from another source. What is assumed, however, for the purposes of this typology, is that most curricula strive to encourage certain dominant loci of reinforcement and attempt to discourage other loci. Some curricula treat all sources of reinforcement equally, however, and sub-descriptor 1.1.1.3.7, which locates reinforcement in the Instructional Activity, as well as the Instructors and Peers, provides for this indiscriminant

structure. But for most curricula, a significant dimension of the overall orientation can be described by noting the dominant locus of reinforcement. This dominant locus will shape the sorts of child-instructor-activity interactions which help define the curricular orientation.

To recapitulate and summarize the above distinction, the abbreviated loci of reinforcement which appears on the complete Program Element Typology is reprinted below.

1.1.1.3 Locus of Reinforcement

- 1.1.1.3.1 Instructional Activity
- 1.1.1.3.2 Instructors
- 1.1.1.3.3 Peers
- 1.1.1.3.4 Instructional Activity and Instructors
- 1.1.1.3.5 Instructional Activity and Peers
- 1.1.1.3.6 Instructors and Peers
- 1.1.1.3.7 Instructional Activity, Instructors and Peers

Program Descriptor: 1.1.2 Curricular Design

The program descriptor, Curricular Design, departs from the theoretical-philosophical realm surveyed by the previous descriptor of Curricular Orientation and focuses on three pragmatic questions which illuminate the internal structure of various curricula. This program descriptor seeks to answer the following questions: (1) What sort of activities take place during the instructional process? (2) How is time utilized during the instructional period?

and (3) In what sorts of groups does instruction occur? It is felt that these questions reflect essential concerns which must be addressed in the creation of a curriculum and by attending to these concerns, a better understanding of the divergence and commonality of various curricula can be obtained. Accordingly, the three foci of the program descriptor, Curricular Design, are: (1) Activities; (2) Time Utilization; and (3) Instructional Grouping. We will now examine variations possible in these three areas.

1.1.2.1 Activities

Two considerations can help define the instructional activities which are at the heart of a curriculum. First, we may concentrate on the sorts of activities which occur during the instructional period. Secondly, we can observe the uniformity with which these activities take place. We will consider these issues in turn.

In consideration of the general nature of the activities which occur during the instructional period, three broad categories are useful to partition the many activity variations into general domains. These general domains which specify broad types of activity are entitled: (1) Manipulative-Exploratory; (2) Productive-Responsive; and (3) Mixed Orientation.

Manipulative-Exploratory activities, as the name implies, encourage physical activity and movement throughout the instructional setting. Many objects are present for

the child to utilize in learning interactions. Exploration and investigation of the environment is encouraged. It is thought to be essential that the child is physically involved in activity. Typical manipulative-exploratory activities for a child might include arranging, sorting or cataloguing objects in some fashion, drawing or painting pictures, constructing models with wood, telling or writing stories, acting in plays, and generally exploring and manipulating the classroom environment.

Another approach is found in productive-responsive activities. In these activities, the child is not expected to be initiatory and assertive, but to respond in an appropriate manner to the learning task. Unlike manipulative-exploratory activities, the emphasis of productive-responsive activities is on performing the learning task in a specified manner. Certain dimensions of appropriate task performance are defined in advance, and the child is encouraged to respond to the learning task with appropriate behavior. These activities tend to be less freewheeling than the manipulative-exploratory ones, and are generally structured to produce a specific learning outcome for the child. Typical productive-responsive activities include seatwork, drill, or the completion of learning exercises structured to bring children to a pre-determined goal.

The final category, the Mixed Orientation, requires little explanation. It indicates that both sorts of activities are employed for instructional purposes. A

curriculum in this category, for example, could stress productive-responsive activities for the teaching of reading, but teach math using manipulative-exploratory ones. Or both sorts of activities might be combined to teach a single subject area.

Beyond the nature of the activities which contribute to the design of a curriculum, the uniformity of these activities is another important consideration. The Uniformity of Activity dimension is an important one, because the more uniform the activities in a classroom, the more certain it is that each child will receive the same instructional treatment.

Although uniformity of activity is a significant concept, it is a difficult one to define, as the notion of uniformity can be specified at different levels of analysis. For example, in one classroom all children may be engaged in reading seatwork, but with different reading materials and be proceding through these materials at different rates. Should this be considered a uniform activity? Similarly, in another classroom, all the children are engaged in the same activity, putting on a play, but some children are acting, while others draw posters and others paint scenery. Again, one can wonder if this is to be considered a uniform activity. Finally, consider the classroom in which some children are constructing model ships, while others bind sticks to make toy tepees for social studies, and others drill holes in wood to make bird feeders. Amidst

the hammering and the drilling, the question arises as to whether the activities in this classroom can be considered uniform.

For the purposes of this typology, uniformity of activity will be said to occur when the activities of all children are focused toward the same immediate instructional objective. Thus in the examples given above, the class involved in individually-paced and chosen reading work, and the class constructing objects with their hands could be considered to be involved in uniform activity, while the class producing the play would not be so considered since some children are learning to act, while others learn to paint and draw. It is worth noting that both manipulative-exploratory and productive-responsive activities can be considered diverse or identical, depending on the immediate instructional aim of those activities.

In the program Element Typology, the concept of uniformity of activity can be divided into three categories: (1) Diverse; (2) Identical; and, as before, (3) Mixed. A brief treatment of each category will be given below.

Diverse activity is said to occur when children pursue qualitatively different learning goals as the immediate objective of their learning. Any group activity which encourages different children to participate in qualitatively different ways and hence to facilitate qualitatively different learning goals is considered diverse. On the other hand, an identical activity has the same qualita-

tive learning goal for all children, even though their moment-to-moment activities may seem different.

A mixed orientation once more allows for the combination of the above approaches and does not present a dominant emphasis. An example of this type of curricular design might be one in which some instructional time is allotted for children to pursue activities of their choice, but later requires them to write a story about their chosen activity.

To recapitulate and summarize the above discussion, the treatment of curricular activities which appears in the complete Program Element Typology appears below.

1.1.2.1 Activities

1.1.2.1.1 Nature of Activities

1.1.2.1.1.1 Manipulative-Exploratory. Concentration on the facilitation of the child's exploration of the environment and the physical manipulation of objects. Activities and materials vary a great deal. Utilization of the materials in diverse ways is encouraged.

1.1.2.1.1.2 Productive-Responsive. Concentration on the facilitation of specified responses. Activities and materials structured and uniform. Production of the desired behavior is encouraged.

1.1.2.1.1.3 Mixed Orientation. - Elements of both approaches. No Dominant Emphasis.

1.1.2.1.2 Uniformity of Activities

1.1.2.1.2.1 Diverse: Children pursue different activities during the Instructional Period.

1.1.2.1.2.2 Identical: Children pursue the same activity during the Instructional Period.

1.1.2.1.2.3 Mixed Orientation. Elements of both approaches. No Dominant Emphasis.

1.1.2.2 Time Utilization

The question of how instructional time can best be utilized has a long history of educational debate. The variable of time, generally measured in instructional days, appears regularly in educational research. Like personnel and materials, time is an important resource which can be spent in different ways to create diverse instructional environments. The use of instructional time can be measured and categorized in various subtle ways, but in the interest of descriptive economy, three categories have been generated to consider this dimension in the design of curricula. These dimensions are: (1) Diffuse; (2) Concentrated; and (3) Mixed. A discussion of these dimensions appears below.

Time utilization is considered to be diffuse when time is rather equally allotted to all academic subjects. With this utilization of time, no subjects are selected for special emphasis or treatment. Given this orientation, learning is generally considered as an organic process, and

it is thought to emphasize some subjects at the expense of others, would distort and unbalance the equilibrium of the organic learning process.

The utilization of time in a concentrated manner, however, provides another approach to spending time, and stresses that more of the overall time resource must be allotted to specified subject areas. Such a concentrated emphasis is undertaken in the belief that certain subject areas are more important than others because they are considered to be essential for further learning and success in school. Because of this assumption, it is thought that instructional time must be concentrated on these areas, so that children will not be short-changed in the acquisition of these basic skills.

In regard to time utilization, the mixed orientation provides a middle ground between the concentrated and diffuse approaches. This category suggests that there may be slight emphasis given some subjects, but not enough to warrant the placement of time utilization in the concentrated category. The mixed category suffers, like many others in this typology, from a lack of operational definition and quantification. Such specification could easily be developed through a more exact analysis of time use in the different Follow Through curricula, and if this typology proves to be conceptually useful, such operational specification would logically seem to be the next step for those elements of the program descriptors which could profit from

more exact quantification.

To summarize the above discussion, the abbreviated definitions of time utilization which appear in the Program Element Typology are displayed below.

1.1.2.2 Time Utilization

1.1.2.2.1 Diffuse. No specific subjects singled out for emphasis. Attention broadly focused on wide range of possible learning activities.

1.1.2.2.2 Concentrated. Intensive attention to specific subjects such as reading, mathematics, handwriting. Minimum daily time allocation for these areas may be specified by the sponsor.

1.1.2.2.3 Mixed Orientation. Elements of both approaches. No Dominant Focus.

1.1.2.3 Instructional Grouping

The practice of instructional grouping has stirred debate and emotional controversy as perhaps no other topic in the educational literature. Indeed, one Follow Through curricular approach stresses multi-age grouping as the key curricular element.[3] Current reform efforts consistently call for heterogeneity in grouping practices, one of the most recent effort being the court-mandated mainstreaming of the educationally handicapped. For the purposes of the Program Element Typology, the concept, Instructional Grouping, refers to the characteristics of the other children within the instructional group, and also to the size of that group.

The fundamental concept of group is more complex

than is evident at first glance and deserves further definition. For the purposes of this paper, an assemblage of children will be considered an instructional group if three criteria are met. First, the children must be located in relatively close physical proximity to one another, the outer boundary being no greater than the area of an average self-contained classroom. Thus, for the purposes of this paper, all of the first graders in five separate classrooms within the same school would not be considered a group since they do not meet the criterion of physical proximity. Secondly, for a collection of children to be considered an instructional group, there must be verbal or physical interaction among the children. Given this second criterion, five children who are seated in a small circle reading silently and who do not converse or interact with one another would be considered to be working alone rather than in a small group. Finally, the children must be involved in an instructional activity which has uniform instructional objectives. This criterion suggests that five children who are sitting in close proximity and talking amongst themselves, but working on diverse academic subjects do not constitute an instructional group.

There are two key categories which distinguish the instructional grouping practices of various curricular designs: (1) Variability; and (2) Size.

Variability refers to the overall homogeneity or heterogeneity which characterize the children in an

instructional group. Homogeneity and heterogeneity, for categories of age and developmental or performance level, are relative terms, and need to be defined to avoid confusion. For the purposes of this typology, a group will be considered homogeneous in regards to age if the childrens' birth dates fall within the same chronological year. With regards to performance level, a homogeneous group is one in which the children are all performing within six months of each other on a standardized assessment of educational performance. The criterion of homogeneity of developmental level is more difficult to specify because it is a more diffuse concept which is often defined in different ways by different theoretical orientations and curricula. In applying the Program Element Typology, a group will be considered homogeneous in regard to the developmental level of children if, in the opinion of the instructors, most children are concerned with the same general developmental tasks or thought to be in the same general developmental stage. It should be noted that in this category, like many others in the typology, it is the curricular intent rather than the actual operationalization of this intent which is to be examined in categorizing the curricular design. To place this idea in the language of the program evaluators, the Program Element Typology assumes 100 percent implementation of the sponsor's curriculum, and addresses the question, if the curricular designer had complete control of the

instructional situation, what would occur?

The notion of homogeneity and heterogeneity in regard to sex hardly needs explanation, and may seem to be a useless category since all Follow Through curricula treat boys and girls together. The author wishes to point out, however, that many personality and behavioral differences have been noted between boys and girls, and the idea of separating boys and girls in some instructional groups within the classroom to pursue the same curricular goals may have merit as a curricular experiment. For this reason, the category of homogeneity of sex has been included within the category of instructional grouping.

The size of instructional groups is also an important factor in curriculum design. The recent trend in education has been to move away from instructional arrangements which focus on the entire class and utilize individual and small group instructional methods. This trend is reflected in many of the Follow Through curricula.

The size of the intended instructional groupings can be partitioned into four categories. If a child works alone, this naturally suggests that no other children collaborate in the instructional task. A small group of children is defined to include two to six children. From seven to fifteen children constitutes a large group, and if more than fifteen children work together in the same instructional activity, it is assumed that this arrangement can be considered to include the entire class. Various

combinations of these instructional groupings may, of course, also occur.

The instructor may or may not be a part of the instructional group, but in the cases where the instructor is present as in drill or individual help periods, the instructor's presence is not considered in determining the size of the instructional group.

To conclude this discussion of instructional grouping, the variations possible in this element of curricular design which are listed in the Program Element Typology appear below.

1.1.2.3 Instructional Grouping

1.1.2.3.1 Variability

1.1.2.3.1.1 Heterogeneous with regard to:

1.1.2.3.1.1.1 Age

1.1.2.3.1.1.2 Sex

1.1.2.3.1.1.3 Developmental or Performance Level

1.1.2.3.1.2 Homogeneous with regard to:

1.1.2.3.1.2.1 Age

1.1.2.3.1.2.2 Sex

1.1.2.3.1.2.3 Developmental or Performance Level

1.1.2.3.2 Size

1.1.2.3.2.1 Child Working Alone (1 Child)

1.1.2.3.2.2 Small Groups (2-6 Children)

1.1.2.3.2.3 Large Groups (7-15 Children)

1.1.2.3.2.4 Entire Class (All Children)

1.1.2.3.2.5 Alone and Small Groups

1.1.2.3.2.6 Alone and Large Groups

1.1.2.3.2.7 Alone and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.8 Small Groups and Large Groups

1.1.2.3.2.9 Small Groups and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.10 Large Groups and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.11 Alone, Small Groups and Large Groups

1.1.2.3.2.12 Alone, Large Groups and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.13 Alone, Small Groups and Entire Class

1.1.2.3.2.14 Alone, Small Groups, Large Groups and Entire Class

Program Descriptor: 1.1.3 Curricular Responsibility

The concept of responsibility within the context of the Instructional focus of the Program Element Typology addresses two broad and significant questions: (1) Who has the power to make and carry out instructional decisions? and (2) What is the nature of these decisions? Considering the diversity of Follow Through curricula, there are no consensual answers to these questions, and the issues of responsibility and concurrent autonomy, like the other educational issues which have served as foci for the program

descriptors, generate diverse opinions, and often, heated disagreement.

The types of responsibility given to different individuals throughout the instructional process varies a great deal in different curricular approaches. Consider for a moment, the essential question of who should be given primary responsibility for educating children. Should this job be assigned to teachers or parents? Both teachers and parents serve as educators of children, and different Follow Through program approaches have put different emphasis on the roles of teachers within the classroom and parents within the home.

No matter which party is responsible for the actual maintenance of the instructional interaction with the child, other equally important instructional decisions must also be made. Who, for example, is to be held responsible for planning or generating the potentially available instructional activities and materials? Who will be given the responsibility for choosing the activities which will take place during the daily instructional period. And, finally, who will evaluate the progress of individual children toward the attainment of instructional goals and plan for the future individual work of each child? These are the central issues which define the program descriptor of curricular responsibility, and although they are largely self-explanatory, they will be discussed briefly below. The questions of curricular responsibility have been

arranged chronologically, and will be considered in the following order. The concerns of: (1) Pre-Instructional; (2) Instructional; and finally, (3) Post-Instructional.

1.1.2.1 Pre-Instructional

Before a child becomes engaged in a learning activity, a great deal of planning and thought is necessary to make the learning activities potentially available for the child. The responsibility for the generation or specification of instructional materials can be vested in diverse parties, and different curricula allocate this responsibility in different ways. A second area of responsibility which can vary widely in its assignment, concerns the guidelines for the use of these materials or, in the terms of the Program Element Typology, in the generation or specification of instructional activities. By considering who is given the responsibility to select and develop materials and activities, a useful measure of the autonomy of the individual instructor can be obtained. If the instructor is to be solely responsible for these tasks, the instructor is allowed a great deal of autonomy. On the other hand, if the instructor's role is to implement the activities and materials designed or selected primarily by the sponsor, the instructor's autonomy is considerably decreased. A middle ground exists where the sponsor and the instructor take joint responsibility for the creation of materials and activities.

It should again be noted that the term, instructor, refers to the individual who is responsible for the actual instruction of the child and may be a parent inside the home as well as a classroom teacher.

To recapitulate the above discussion, the various pre-instructional responsibilities listed in the Program Element Typology are presented below.

1.1.3.1 Pre-Instructional

1.1.3.1.1 Generation or Specification of Instructional Materials

1.1.3.1.1.1 Sponsor

1.1.3.1.1.2 Instructors

1.1.3.1.1.3 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.1.2 Generation or Specification of Instructional Activities

1.1.3.1.2.1 Sponsor

1.1.3.1.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.1.2.3 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.2 Instructional

During the period of instruction, there are two areas of responsibility which distinguish different curricular approaches. The first area concerns the individual who is given actual responsibility for the maintenance of the instructional interaction. As it has been noted, some curricula see the primary responsibility for instruction resting with the classroom teacher, while others place the parent in this instructional role. A third approach divides

instructional responsibility between the teachers at school and the parents at home.

No matter which party is responsible for maintaining and supervising the instructional activities, the issue of who will have responsibility for the immediate activity selection during the instructional period raises another question. In curricula which are designed with the goal of encouraging the autonomy and independence of the child, it is often the child who has the primary responsibility for choosing the activities which will be the focus of the instructional period. The opposite approach is found in curricula which give the instructor the primary responsibility for deciding with which activities the children will be engaged during the instructional period. In between these polar approaches, there is the intermediate position where both the child and the instructor are mutually responsible for activity selection. This intermediate position can be reached in different ways. For example, the child may be given freedom to choose activities for part of the instructional period, but be required to participate in other activities chosen by the teacher. Or, the child and the instructor might confer and reach a joint decision concerning the appropriate instructional pursuit.

To recapitulate, the categories of instructional responsibility are reproduced below as they exist on the Program Element Typology.

1.1.3.2 Instructional

1.1.3.2.1 Maintenance of Instructional Interaction

1.1.3.2.1.1 School-based Instructor

1.1.3.2.1.2 Home-based Parent

1.1.3.2.1.3 School-based Instructor and Home-based Parent

1.1.3.2.2 Activity Selection by:

1.1.3.2.2.1 Child

1.1.3.2.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.2.2.3 Child and Instructors

1.1.3.3 Post-Instructional

The final area of responsibility involves those decisions made after the instructional interaction and concern: (1) Formative Evaluation, and (2) Instructional Prescription.

For most curricula, formative evaluation of a child's progress in relation to curricular goals is an on-going process. This evaluation may occur in a variety of different ways. Most simply, the child may be encouraged to evaluate learning progress and decide "how I'm doing." With this procedure, it is the child who has the primary responsibility for evaluating learning. Another approach is to give the instructor the responsibility to decide "how things are going" for various children. This may be done through informal reflection or through a more formal assessment using specific evaluative instruments. A third

approach places the responsibility for the ongoing evaluation in the hands of the sponsor who can assess the progress of children through elaborate computer-assisted evaluation of criterion tests. Combinations of the above approaches are, of course, also possible. Finally, formative evaluation may be completely eschewed within the classroom in the assumption that the process of evaluation is a threatening one which is antithetical to the learning process.

These diverse approaches to the formative evaluation of the progress of children often lead to definite instructional prescriptions. The child may be expected to take responsibility for determining what learning activities should be pursued, or deciding "to work harder." Similarly, the instructor may be given responsibility for directing the learning activities of certain children and specifying extra work which must be completed. Another approach to instructional prescription is for the sponsor, after analyzing the performance data from criterion tests, to specify the materials on which a child should be working and the rate of progress which should be expected for that child. Once more, combinations of the above approaches may also occur. Finally, no prescription may be made, and curricular activities might occur unchanged as they have in the past.

These distinctions which allocate the responsibility for formative evaluation and instructional prescription in

various ways are summarized below in the excerpt from the Program Element Typology.

1.1.3.3 Post Instructional

1.1.3.3.1 Formative Evaluation by:

1.1.3.3.1.1 Child

1.1.3.3.1.2 Instructors

1.1.3.3.1.3 Sponsor

1.1.3.3.1.4 Child and Instructors

1.1.3.3.1.5 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.3.1.6 Does not apply. No Formative Evaluation Conducted.

1.1.3.3.2 Instructional Prescription by:

1.1.3.3.2.1 Child

1.1.3.3.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.3.2.3 Sponsor

1.1.3.3.2.4 Child and Instructors

1.1.3.3.2.5 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.3.2.6 Does not apply. No Instructional Prescription Made.

Program Descriptor: 1.1.4 Curricular Variability

The final program descriptor used to dintinguish instructional curricula is that of curricular variability. Thus far, the Program Element Typology has been concerned with the orientation, design and responsibilities associated with different curricular approaches. The final question to be addressed concerns the variability of the

curricula. This descriptor is chosen in the belief that it is important to know the stability and variation to be found in individual curricular treatments. Attention to the variability of instructional programs can provide an indication of the consistency of instructional treatment, a variable which could be quite important from the point of view of the program evaluator who is interested in the stability of instructional treatments. If a curriculum does not present a consistent instructional treatment, it may be difficult to associate curricular elements with their effect on the child.

The question of variability is approached from three perspectives, changes in: (1) Instructional Activities; (2) Time Utilization; and (3) Instructional Grouping.

1.1.4.1 Instructional Activities

As has been noted earlier, instructional activities refer to the task-activities which are thought to sustain and facilitate the child's learning. In all curricula there is some theoretical change in these activities as children progress, for example, from book to book or from task to task. For the purposes of this typology, it is assumed that an activity change is defined by a qualitative change in the manner in which a subject is treated, and does not merely refer to changes in activity rate which result from more -- or less -- of "the same." Using this distinction, teaching reading through the methods of seat-

work, flash cards and recitation would demonstrate activity change, but the transition from one sort of reading material to another sort would not show change. Manipulative-exploratory activities would be considered to change if the type of activity changes, for example from drawing, to sorting tasks, to building projects. More and more complete building projects attempted by the same child would not constitute activity change. Changes are considered from the perspective of the individual child involved in the instructional interaction, and although different groups within the same class may be engaged in different activities, these activities are not considered to change unless they change from the perspective of the individual child involved in the activity.

Activity changes, like the other elements of change considered within this program descriptor, are subdivided by temporal categories. The categories utilized in the Program Element Typology are noted below. They proceed in a stairstep fashion. "Change daily" refers to changes within the period of a day. "Change weekly" encompasses changes which occur every two to seven days. "Change monthly" encompasses the period from eight days to a month. "Change yearly" indicates the period from one month and a day to a year.

1.1.4.1 Instructional Activities

1.1.4.1.1 Change Daily

1.1.4.1.2 Change Weekly

1.1.4.1.3 Change Monthly

1.1.4.1.4 Change Yearly

1.1.4.1.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.1.4.1.6 Do Not Change

1.1.4.2 Time Utilization

The second area in which curricular change can affect the nature of the child's learning experience is through the pattern of time utilization. The concept of time utilization has been explained earlier and partitioned into the categories of diffuse and concentrated time use. Variability in time utilization refers to how much change occurs in the selection of the time use categories. For example, a curriculum might alternate on a daily basis between concentrated to subject areas and various non-specific instructional activities. Another curricular approach might devote several months or a year to encouraging children to "mess around" and to become familiar with instructional activities and possibilities, and then begin to concentrate on the development of certain specific skills. Other variations in time utilization can be readily imagined. To conclude this discussion, the temporal variations in time utilization indicated by the Program Element Typology are presented below.

1.1.4.2 Time Utilization

1.1.4.2.1 Changes Daily

1.1.4.2.2 Changes Weekly

1.1.4.2.3 Changes Monthly

1.1.4.2.4 Changes Yearly

1.1.4.2.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.1.4.2.6 Does Not Change

1.1.4.3 Instructional Grouping

In consideration of the potential curricular variations which can readily occur within the existing curriculum, attention must also be focused on the area of instructional grouping. If the pattern of instructional grouping changes, the experience of the individual children within these groups will change as will the consistency of the instructional treatment. Different patterns of grouping may serve different instructional purposes. For example, large group activities may familiarize children with different aspects of the curricula and the behaviors which are expected. Later, small group or individual instruction may take the place of large group presentations. Grouping practices may change each day according to the subject matter which is under consideration. Conversely, once work groups are assembled, they may be encouraged to stay the same so that group cohesiveness and patterns of cooperation can be established.

Once more, the categories which indicate various rates of change in instructional grouping practices, as they appear in the Program Element Typology, are presented below.

1.1.4.3 Instructional Grouping

1.1.4.3.1 Changes Daily

1.1.4.3.2 Changes Weekly

1.1.4.3.3 Changes Monthly

1.1.4.3.4 Changes Yearly

1.1.4.3.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.1.4.3.6 Does Not Change

Program Descriptor: 1.1.5 No Instructional Element

There is little which needs to be said about this descriptor. Its function is to indicate that an intervention approach does not contain an instructional element directed toward children. Programs, for example, for which the primary focus is that of parent education and organization might not contain an instructional element directed toward children.

This concludes the survey of instructional elements directed toward children in the Program Element Typology. We now turn to a consideration of the service element directed toward this same population.

Service Program Element

All Follow Through program approaches provide children with medical, dental, psychological as well as health and nutritional services. This service element is not the subject of planned variation by the program sponsors. Variations which do exist in the actual service delivery programs are idiosyncratic and related more to school district policy, organization and resources than the desires

of the sponsors. Because variations in the service element of Follow Through do not result from differences in sponsor approaches, the Program Element Typology has not attempted to identify the variations possible in the construction of these service elements, although such an expansion of the Program Element Typology is certainly possible. In the next section of this paper, the intent of the various components of the service element of the Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment are briefly noted. Since the treatment of these program descriptors is cursory, the relevant sections of the Program Element Typology will not appear after each program descriptor, but instead will appear at the end of this section.

Program Descriptors: 1.2.1 Medical; 1.2.2 Dental

Medical and dental service delivery programs are provided for all children in Follow Through and consist of at the least, an examination and subsequent referral or treatment for any medical or dental problems. Appropriate follow-up care is also provided and often continues beyond the child's actual participation in Follow Through.

Program Descriptor: 1.2.3 Psychological

There are two ways psychological services are utilized in the Follow Through program approaches. First, psychologists focus on the prevention of psychological problems by advising the instructional personnel and parents

and suggesting the implementation of sound mental health practices. The second concern of the psychologists is the treatment of children who manifest emotional disorders. The major thrust of the Follow Through psychological services is preventive, and attempts are made within the various program approaches to ensure the development and maintenance of an instructional environment conducive to psychological growth and maturation as well as cognitive learning.

Program Descriptor: 1.2.4 Health and Nutrition

There are two basic elements to the health and nutrition component of the Follow Through program. First, educational programs are established to teach the child good nutritional and health practices. Secondly, the Follow Through program provides lunch, snacks, and when needed, breakfast and supper. These health and nutritional components work together to educate the child about appropriate eating habits and to provide the child with a balanced meal.

Program Descriptor: 1.2.5 No Service Element

This program descriptor does not apply to any of the current Follow Through program approaches, but has been included in the Program Element Typology to provide a descriptive category for instructional interventions which do not also focus on the delivery of services. For the

purposes of characterizing the current Follow Through Program approaches, however, this is not a functional category.

To summarize the various components which make up the service element of intervention programs focused on children, the relevant portion of the Program Element Typology is presented below.

1.2 Service Element

1.2.1 Medical

1.2.1.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.2 Dental

1.2.2.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.3 Psychological

1.2.3.1 Preventive: Advise Instructional Personnel

1.2.3.2 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.3.3 Preventive as well as Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.4 Health and Nutrition

1.2.4.1 Educational Program

1.2.4.2 Meal Program

1.2.4.3 Educational and Meal Program

1.2.5 No Service Element

This completes the discussion of the potential variations in the instructional and service elements of the Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment which are directed toward children. As has been noted earlier,

children are only one population affected by the Follow Through intervention, and the populations of Instructors and Parents remain to be considered. We turn to a consideration of the ways in which various Follow Through program approaches affect the training of instructors.

Program Element Directed Toward Instructors

It should be noted that the current Follow Through program approaches focus only on the pre-service and in-service education of instructors and do not offer additional services, since such services are generally the responsibility of the individual school district.

Instructional Program Element

Program Descriptor: 2.1.1 Overall Orientation

As with the instructional element directed toward children, the first program descriptor is concerned with the overall thrust of the instructional program. Three different theoretical emphases and the combinations have been identified. These orientations are: (1) Encouragement of Individual Personal Development; (2) Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor; and (3) Internalization of Behaviorally Specified Responses to Instructional Contingencies. We will examine these orientations in turn.

The position of some sponsors concerning staff training is that the individual teacher must be given aid in the support in the development of their own unique instructional style and method. Given this orientation, the purpose of pre-service and in-service training is the encouragement of individual personal development. In the words of one sponsor, the task is "to extend" the capabilities of the individual instructors. This goal, since it

is person-specific, cannot be achieved through training in instructional methods or by creating uniform behavioral or theoretical expectations, but instead, relies on the growth which results from the sharing of perceptions and ideas in a non-threatening interpersonal environment. This orientation concentrates on developing individuals rather than implementing curricula.

A second approach focuses less on the facilitation of the personal growth of the instructor and more on the introduction and explanation of the theoretical approach of the curriculum. This approach to instruction stresses familiarization with the philosophy and principles of the sponsor, which are reflected in the curricular design. Instructors are presented with the ideas which shape the curricular approach and encouraged to learn to "think like the sponsor." This orientation stresses the understanding of the central principles of the curricular approach so that instructors can make appropriate instructional decisions based on this solid understanding.

It is interesting to note that this approach stands midway between the first instructional orientation which focuses on personal development and the next approach which focuses on the production of specified instructional responses. The "familiarization" approach seems to combine structure and autonomy in that it leaves the choice of the immediately appropriate instructional actions up to the instructor, while making it clear that appropriate in-

structional behavior must be based upon the principles of the sponsor's curricula.

The third orientation stresses the internalization of behaviorally specified responses to instructional contingencies. This is a pragmatic approach which puts the emphasis on appropriate action rather than the comprehension of sometimes complex theory. Appropriate instructional technique is specified in behavioral terms rather than theoretical ones. As a result, the opportunity for instructors to make autonomous decisions would appear to be reduced. However, the duration of training needed to bring the naive instructor up to the performance level expected by the sponsor is considerably less, and thus this approach can be implemented rapidly with consistent performance by the instructor.

To recapitulate these distinctions, the relevant portion of the Program Element Typology appears below.

2.1.1 Overall Orientation

- 2.1.1.1 Encouragement of Individual Personal Development
- 2.1.1.2 Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor
- 2.1.1.3 Internalization of Behaviorally Specified Responses to Instructional Contingencies
- 2.1.1.4 Encouragement of Individual Personal Development and Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor
- 2.1.1.5 Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor and Internalization of Behaviorally Specified Responses to Instructional Contingencies

Program Descriptor: 2.1.2 Means of Evaluation

We turn now to a consideration of the arrangements utilized by different curricular approaches to train instructors. Four general methods of instruction have been identified after a consideration of the various program approaches of the Follow Through Planned Variation experiment. These means of instruction are: (1) Demonstration Classroom; (2) Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results; (3) Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising; and (4) Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods.

The first way in which the training of Follow Through instructors occurs is through the participation in or observation of a demonstration classroom. A functioning classroom which provides a model of what should occur in the teacher's own classroom affords readily accessible information concerning the proper techniques of curricular implementation. Such a method of training is convenient and allows the direct involvement of instructors in an established instructional environment.

A second approach to instruction involves sponsor observation using an observation schedule and feedback of the results. An observation schedule is an observational device which allows an observer to determine whether the activities observed within an instructional situation correspond to the activities expected by the sponsor in the same situation. Discrepancies between the actual

observed behaviors and the expectations of the curricular model are then presented, or "fed back," to the instructor. This information guides the instructor in the improvement of instructional interaction, and recognizes instructional successes as well as inadequacies. It should be noted that with this method of instruction -- as well as with the demonstration classroom -- the instructional model must be well-enough specified by the sponsor so that decisions can be made regarding congruence or discrepancy with that model. A particular sponsor must be able to determine that a specific classroom is functioning or not functioning as expected. From this operationalization of the instructional model, an appropriate observation instrument can be constructed.

The third means of instruction, informal sponsor observation and advising, is similar to the last method, only it relies less on the operational specification of a curricular model and more on the judgment of the sponsor's representatives who direct the training of instructors. Since the correct implementation of some instructional models depends on the judicious application of specific theoretical principles, and since there are generally different ways to apply the same principle within an instructional situation, a less strict method of observation is utilized by some program approaches to train instructors. Informal observation and advising gives more autonomy to trainers and instructors and may result in classrooms

which have a less uniform appearance than those which optimally result from the more structured observational method. This leeway for individuality can be seen as an allowance for creative autonomy or as the creation of a sloppy instructional treatment depending upon the values ascribed to autonomy and uniformity.

The final means of instruction, the presentation/explanation of theory or teaching methods, is utilized, to some degree, by all of the various program approaches. Just as "chalk talk" is a staple of athletic training, the lecture/demonstration is generally part of the sponsor's introduction to a specific curricular approach. Different sponsors will rely upon this didactic presentation in different ways. Some training sessions may present information, some may answer questions and some may utilize this method to organize a more complex training effort.

These various means of instruction can be combined, and most sponsors utilize a variety of instructional methods. It should be reiterated that these methods can be applied to the training of either home-based or school-based instructors.

To recapitulate, as well as to suggest the various combinations of methods which can be profitably combined, the relevant section of the Program Element Typology is excerpted below.

2.1.2 Means of Instruction

2.1.2.1 Demonstration Classroom

2.1.2.2 Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results

2.1.2.3 Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising

2.1.2.4 Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

2.1.2.5 Demonstration Classroom + Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results

2.1.2.6 Demonstration Classroom + Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising

2.1.2.7 Demonstration Classroom + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

2.1.2.8 Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

2.1.2.9 Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

2.1.2.10 Demonstration Classroom + Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

2.1.2.11 Demonstration Classroom + Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

Program Descriptor: 2.1.3 Responsibility for Planning and Facilitating Instruction

The responsibility for the planning and directing of training events is allocated differently in various curricular approaches. This program descriptor accounts for this variation by considering three ways in which this responsibility can be distributed. Primary responsibility for training may be given to: (1) the Sponsor; (2) the

Instructors; or (3) shared by the Sponsor and Instructors.

When training is planned and directed by the sponsor, then it is the sponsor (or sponsor's representatives) who decides what will take place within the training sessions and how the sessions will be conducted.

Conversely, when this responsibility is allocated to the instructors, this group is responsible for planning the training agenda and directing the training sessions.

In between these extremes, the responsibility for the content and the direction of training sessions may be distributed between the sponsor and the instructors. The instructors might, for example, define the issues which need the technical expertise of the sponsor's staff. Another approach would encourage the instructors to share their insight and skills during one part of the training as well as to require instructors to participate in later training sessions directed by the sponsor's representatives. Other combinatory approaches could be readily imagined.

To summarize, the relevant portion of the Program Element Typology is presented below.

2.1.3 Responsibility for Planning and Facilitating Instruction of Instructors

2.1.3.1 Sponsor

2.1.3.2 Instructors

2.1.3.3 Sponsor and Instructors

Program Descriptor: 2.1.4 Formative Evaluation

The behavior and competencies of instructors, like those of the children they teach, is often a focus for evaluation. Both instructors and program sponsors want to know "how the instructor is doing." Such information can alleviate some of the confusion and uncertainties of the instructor as well as provide the curriculum designer with information concerning the implementation of the curriculum. This question of formative evaluation can be approached through the means of: (1) Self-Evaluation, and (2) Evaluation by Others. There are various distinctions which can be applied to these overall evaluative stances. These distinctions will be discussed below.

In instructional approaches which employ self-evaluation, the responsibility for the assessment of the instructor's performance lies with the individual instructor. A curriculum which emphasizes self-evaluation generally assumes that the instructor is the best person to evaluate the instructional interaction. The curriculum may further assume that evaluations by others are more threatening than self-evaluations, and that since self-evaluation will evoke less defensiveness on the part of the instructor, it more readily leads to behavioral change and instructional improvement.

Self-evaluation may occur in two ways. The first approach relies on the instructor's naturalistic impressions of "how things are going." The intuitions and feelings of

the instructor provide the data regarding the success of the instructional program. Criteria of success are not defined in advance by the sponsor, but are generated as a result of the instructional process by the individual instructor.

The second approach to self-evaluation relies on the instructor to make the actual assessment of performance, but supplies the instructor with criteria which make explicit the sponsor's conception of successful instruction.

It should be noted that any method of formative evaluation is susceptible to the biases and misperceptions of the evaluator. Instructors who are charged with evaluating their own instructional performance may unwittingly perceive the instructional interaction differently than it would be perceived by an outside observer. If a sponsor assumes that self-perceptions are biased and generally inaccurate, then self-evaluation may not be included as part of the process of formative evaluation. Bias and inaccuracies, however, may result from the observations of others as well as from self-evaluations. Because errors in evaluation may come from any source, the choice of an evaluative stance is generally determined by the sponsor's assumptions concerning the evaluative method thought to provide the instructor with the most useful understanding of instructional successes and failures and considered to lead most directly to the subsequent remediation of instructional failures. Whether the evaluative agent is the

instructor or an outside observer, the primary goal of formative evaluation is always diagnosis and remediation of instructional deficiencies.

The second evaluative stance incorporates evaluation by individuals other than the instructor. Two broad groups of individuals may be charged with this responsibility, the sponsor's representatives and the instructor's peers. Advantages have been suggested for both approaches. The sponsor's representatives may be most familiar with the appropriate operationalization of the curricular design and orientation, but the feedback and advice from these individuals may not have as much impact on the behavior of instructors as would the equivalent advice coming from an instructor's peers. Conversely, evaluation by the sponsor's representatives may be less threatening to the individual instructor than would peer evaluation since the instructor is not in daily contact with the sponsor's representative. Such evaluation might also be more highly respected since it comes from an authoritative source.

Whomever is chosen to serve as an external evaluator -- and some curricular approaches enlist both peers and sponsor's representatives -- an equally important question concerns the criteria on which instructors will be judged. Two criteria of success are employed in the Follow Through program approaches. First, the expected behaviors of an instructor may be specified in advance and

the instructional process may be observed to see if they occur. This process of observation may employ a structured observation schedule, or it may rely upon the knowledge and experience of the observer to determine appropriate instructional interaction. The second approach does not concentrate on the behaviors of the instructor, but focuses instead on the progress of the children in specified academic areas. If children progress as expected, then the instructor may be assumed to be doing an adequate job. A combination of these two approaches might utilize the assessment of children's progress for the primary evaluation of the adequacy of an instructor, and then use directed observation to determine what could be improved. Other combinations of the two methods of evaluation are certainly possible.

To recapitulate this treatment of formative evaluation, the relevant portions of the Program Element Typology appear below.

2.1.4 Formative Evaluation

2.1.4.1 Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.1.1 Based on Instructor's Perceptions of Classroom Interaction

2.1.4.1.2 Based on Implementation Criteria

2.1.4.1.3 No Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.2 Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.1 Evaluators

2.1.4.2.1.1 Sponsor (or Sponsor's Representative)

2.1.4.2.1.2 Peer Instructors

2.1.4.2.1.3 Sponsor and Peer Instructors

2.1.4.2.1.4 No Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.2 Means of Evaluation

2.1.4.2.2.1 Directed Observation

2.1.4.2.2.2 Assessment of Children's Progress

2.1.4.2.2.3 Directed Observation and Assessment of Children's Progress

Program Descriptor: 2.1.5 No Instructional Element

This program descriptor denotes that a program approach does not contain an instructional element directed toward the population of instructors.

This completes the treatment of the potential variations which characterize the instructional interventions directed toward instructors within the family of Follow Through program approaches. We have now dealt with the parts of these program approaches which involve children and instructors. To complete this examination of the variety of Follow Through program approaches, we turn to a consideration of how these programs can affect the parents of children involved in Follow Through.

Program Elements Directed Toward Parents

All Follow Through program approaches encourage the participation of parents in some manner. This section of the Program Element Typology employs three program descriptors to define three major axes of parental involvement: (1) Instructional; (2) Unsalaried Participation; and (3) Employment. Most Follow Through program approaches include a combination of these elements in their overall effort to involve parents.

Instructional Program Element

Program Descriptor: 3.1.1 Primary Focus

Many of the instructional programs directed toward parents, because they are not the product of a particular sponsor's curricular design, do not show the uniformity found in other instructional elements. Some parent education programs, it is true, are the direct product and most important emphasis of a sponsor's curriculum. But these are in the minority. For most Follow Through program approaches, parent education is left up to the Follow Through program staff at the intervention site. Such overall autonomy argues against treatment of parental instruction as a uniform curricular approach, and suggests the inutility of a detailed treatment of this instructional element. A more useful approach is thought to result from attention to the primary focus of the instructional effort rather than the design of that effort, and this is the

approach of the Program Element Typology.

Four foci of parental instruction have been identified from examination of current Follow Through program approaches: (1) Concentration on the Parent-Child Interaction; (2) Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Curriculum; (3) Concentration on Social Change and Community Action Skills; and (4) Concentration on Principles of Budgeting, Nutrition and Health Care.

Parent education efforts which show a concentration on the parent child interaction are cognizant of the great potential for children's learning which exists in the home. Children can spend a great deal of time after the school day and during the summer with a parent, and it is the aim of such an educational focus to make this interaction time especially profitable for the development of the child. In some program approaches, parent-child interaction is considered more important in the child's intellectual development than the child's experience at school. In other program approaches, parent-child interaction is thought to complement the child's learning within the school situation.

A second purpose of the parent education component of a Follow Through program approach may be the familiarization with the philosophy and principles of the sponsor's curriculum. This introduction to curricular design helps to explain the reasoning behind the child's school activities and the specific goals of the program approach.

A third type of parent education effort shows a concentration on social change and community action skills. This program approach locates the necessary locus of change not in the school or the home, but within the community. Parents are taught how to organize themselves to make their collective voice known within the local government. This approach is often linked with the community control of schools and attempts to encourage parents to take more responsibility to understand and act upon the issues which affect their lives and the lives of their children.

The final focus of parent education efforts shows a concentration on the principles of budgeting, nutrition, health care, and other basic concerns of home economics. Advice is given about meal planning, comparison shopping, first aid, and other practical concerns faced by parents in the process of raising children. Attention is not directly focused on the parent-child interaction with this approach, but rather on the skills thought to benefit the overall environment of the home.

To summarize the above discussion and to indicate the combinations of these foci found in some of the Follow Through program approaches, the relevant portion of the Program Element Typology is presented below.

3.1 Instructional Element

3.1.1 Primary Focus

3.1.1.1 Concentration on the Parent-Child Interaction

3.1.1.2 Familiarization with Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor's Curriculum

3.1.1.3 Concentration on Social Change and Community Action Skills

3.1.1.4 Concentration on Principles of Budgeting, Nutrition and Health Care

3.1.1.5 Concentration on the Parent-Child Interaction and Social Change and Community Action Skills

3.1.1.6 Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor's Curriculum and Social Change and Community Action Skills

3.1.1.7 Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor's Curriculum and Principles of Budgeting, Nutrition and Health Care

3.1.1.8 Concentration on Social Change and Community Action Skills and Principles of Budgeting, Nutrition and Health Care

Program Descriptor: 3.1.2 No Instructional Element

This program descriptor indicates that the program approach does not contain an instructional element directed toward parents.

Participatory Program Element (Unsalaried)

Program Descriptor: 3.2.1 Primary Focus

As in the past, this program descriptor describes the nature of participatory activities available to Follow Through parents. Three categories of involvement have been identified: (1) Community Organization and School Governance; (2) Instruction; and the combination of (3) Commu-

nity Organization, School Governance, and Instruction.

Parents whose unsalaried participation in Follow Through is in the area of community organization and school governance are involved working to bring change to their neighborhoods and to their schools. Typical volunteer activities include organizing, publicizing and hosting meetings, attending the meetings of local government, observing court sessions, or organizing after-school activities.

Parents who participate in the instruction of children work in the classroom as assistants to the formal instructor and aid in the supervision, management and teaching of the Follow Through class. In this way, the use of parents increases the instructional attention given to each child, while the parents learn more about the Follow Through Program approach.

The final type of volunteer parent involvement unites the two previous approaches and focuses on community organization, school governance and instruction. To summarize the above distinctions, the relevant portion of the Program Element Typology appears below.

3.2 Participatory Element (Unsalaried)

3.2.1 Primary Focus

3.2 1.1 Community Organization and School Governance

3.2.1.2 Instructional Assistants

3.2.1.3 Community Organization and School Governance as well as Instructional Assistants

Program Descriptor: 3.2.2 No Participatory Element

This program descriptor indicates that the intervention program approach does not contain an unsalaried participatory element for parents in its overall design. Since all of the Follow Through program approaches encourage parent participation, this descriptor does not apply to Follow Through Intervention Programs. Program approaches can be imagined, however, in which parent participation was not encouraged. For the purposes of symmetry, and to make provision for this eventuality, this program descriptor is included in the Program Element Typology.

Employment Program Element

Program Descriptor: 3.3.1 Primary Focus

The final type of impact Follow Through program approaches may have on the population of parents is through the provision of employment. Four categories of parental employment have been distinguished after consideration of various Follow Through program approaches. These employment categories include: (1) Instructional; (2) Administrative; (3) School-Community Liaison; and (4) Community Organization.

Instructional employment, like unsalaried instructional participation, utilizes parents in the classroom as teachers' aides and instructional assistants. Administrative employment is a broad category which includes data

collection and other non-instructional duties as well as the organizational duties generally associated with administrative positions.

Employment in the capacity of school-community liaison allows parents to bridge the gap between the world of the school and the home. Particular responsibilities include the dissemination of relevant information to each group and the resolution of misunderstandings and disputes which may arise. The chairman of the Follow Through Parent Advisory Committee generally is charged with the responsibility to facilitate school-community relations although it may be dispersed over several individuals. The final category of parental employment does not focus on the school functioning, but on community organization. The responsibilities which are associated with this position have been discussed earlier in this section, and generally involve organizing the community to make its voice heard in matters of school and local governance.

To recapitulate the above distinctions and to indicate the combinations of foci which are found in Follow Through program approaches, the relevant portion of the Program Element Typology appears below.

3.3 Employment Element

3.3.1 Primary Focus

3.3.1.1 Instructional

3.3.1.2 Administrative

3.3.1.3 School-Community Liaison

3.3.1.4 Community Organization

3.3.1.5 Instructional and Administrative

3.3.1.6 Instructional and School-Community Liaison

3.3.1.7 Instructional, Administrative and School-Community Liaison

Program Descriptor: 3.3.2 No Employment Element

Although this program descriptor does not apply to any of the current Follow Through program approaches, it is possible to conceive of an intervention program which did not include parental employment. To account for this eventuality, and to maintain symmetry, this program descriptor has been included in the Program Element Typology.

This concludes the examination of the theoretical orientation, structure, and impact of the various elements which make up the Program Element Typology. In the final section of this paper, these elements will be employed to delineate the characteristics of five diverse Follow Through program approaches.

III. THE PROGRAM ELEMENT TYPOLOGY: EXAMPLES OF ITS USE

The Program Element Typology:

Examples of Its Use

This final section of the paper utilizes the Program Element Typology to describe five diverse Follow Through program approaches which differ in philosophy, curricular design and focal impact.

Since the dimensions of the Program Element Typology have been defined in the previous section of the paper, this final section will not reiterate the definitions of the program elements and descriptors, but instead will illustrate schematically the design of each program approach through the use of the program descriptors and sub-descriptors.

The program approaches chosen for explication are the following:

1. AFRAM Parent Implementation Approach, sponsored by AFRAM Associates, Inc., 68-72 East 131st St., Harlem, New York 10037;

2. Behavior Analysis Approach, sponsored by the Department of Human Development, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044;

3. Cognitively Oriented Curriculum Model, sponsored by the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 600 N. River St., Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197;

4. EDC Open Education Program, sponsored by the Educational Development Center (EDC), 55 Chapel St., Newton, Massachusetts 02160; and

5. Florida Parent Educational Model, sponsored by The Florida Educational Research and Development Council, University of Florida, College of Education, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

AFRAM Parent Implementation Approach

1 Children
- 1.1 Instructional Element
  - 1.1.5 No Instructional Element
- 1.2 Service Element
  - 1.2.1 Medical
    - 1.2.1.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment
  - 1.2.2 Dental
    - 1.2.2.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment
  - 1.2.3 Psychological
    - 1.2.3.2 Examination and Referral or Treatment
  - 1.2.4 Health and Nutrition
    - 1.2.4.3 Educational and Meals Program

2 Instructors
- 2.1 Instructional Element
  - 2.1.5 No Instructional Element

3 Parents
- 3.1 Instructional Element
  - 3.1.1 Primary Focus
    - 3.1.1.3 Concentration on Social Change and Community Action Skills
- 3.2 Participatory Element (Unsalaried)
  - 3.2.1 Primary Focus
    - 3.2.1.1 Community Organization and School Governance
- 3.3 Employment Element
  - 3.3.1 Primary Focus
    - 3.3.1.1 Community Organization

# # #

University of Kansas
Behavior Analysis Approach

1 Children
- 1.1 Instructional Element
  - 1.1.1 Curricular Orientation
    - 1.1.1.1 Learning Emphasis
      - 1.1.1.1.2 Performance
    - 1.1.1.2 Instructional Role
      - 1.1.1.2.2 Regulated
    - 1.1.1.3 Locus of Reinforcement
      - 1.1.1.3.2 Instructors
  - 1.1.2 Curricular Design
    - 1.1.2.1 Activities
      - 1.1.2.1.1 Nature of Activities
        - 1.1.2.1.1.2 Productive-Responsive
      - 1.1.2.1.2 Uniformity of Activities
        - 1.1.2.1.2.2 Identical
    - 1.1.2.2 Time Utilization
      - 1.1.2.2.2 Concentrated
    - 1.1.2.3 Instructional Grouping
      - 1.1.2.3.1 Variability
        - 1.1.2.3.1.1 Heterogeneous with Regard to:
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.1 Age
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.2 Sex
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.3 Performance Level
      - 1.1.2.3.2 Size
        - 1.1.2.3.2.6 Alone and Small Groups
  - 1.1.3 Curricular Responsibility
    - 1.1.3.1 Pre-Instructional
      - 1.1.3.1.1 Generation or Specification of Instructional Materials
        - 1.1.3.1.1.1 Sponsor

1.1.3.1.2 Generation or Specification of Instructional Activities

1.1.3.1.2.1 Sponsor

1.1.3.2 Instructional

1.1.3.2.1 Maintenance of Instructional Interaction

1.1.3.2.1.1 School-based Instructor

1.1.3.2.2 Activity Selection by:

1.1.3.2.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.3 Post Instructional

1.1.3.3.1 Formative Evaluation by:

1.1.3.3.1.3 Sponsor

1.1.3.3.2 Instructional Prescription by:

1.1.3.3.2.3 Sponsor

1.1.4 Curricular Variability

1.1.4.1 Instructional Activities

1.1.4.1.6 Do Not Change

1.1.4.2 Time Utilization

1.1.4.3.6 Does Not Change

1.1.4.3 Instructional Grouping

1.1.4.3.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.2 Service Element

1.2.1 Medical

1.2.1.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.2 Dental

1.2.2.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.3 Psychological

1.2.3.3 Preventive as well as Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.4 Health and Nutrition

1.2.4.3 Educational and Meal Program

2 Instructors

2.1 Instructional Element

2.1.1 Overall Orientation

2.1.1.3 Internalization of Behaviorally Specified Responses to Instructional Contingencies

2.1.2 Means of Instruction

2.1.2.10 Demonstration Classroom + Sponsor Observation Using Observation Schedule and Feedback of Results + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

2.1.3 Responsibility for Planning and Facilitating Instruction

2.1.3.1 Sponsor

2.1.4 Formative Evaluation

2.1.4.1 Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.1.3 No Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.2 Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.1 Evaluators

2.1.4.2.1.1 Sponsor (or Sponsor's Representative)

2.1.4.2.2 Means of Evaluation

2.1.4.2.2.3 Directed Observation and Assessment of Children's Progress

3 Parents

3.1 Instructional Element

3.1.1 Primary Focus

3.1.1.6 Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor's Curriculum + Social Change and Community Action Skills

3.2 Participatory Element (Unsalaried)

3.2.1 Primary Focus

3.2.1.3 Community Organization and School Governance as well as Instructional Assistants

3.3 Employment Element

3.3.1 Primary Focus

3.3.1.7 Instructional, Administrative and School-Community Liaison

# # #

High/Scope Cognitively Oriented
Curriculum Model

1 Children
- 1.1 Instructional Element
  - 1.1.1 Curricular Orientation
    - 1.1.1.1 Learning Emphasis
      - 1.1.1.1.1 Process
    - 1.1.1.2 Instructional Role
      - 1.1.1.2.1 Interpretive
    - 1.1.1.3 Locus of Reinforcement
      - 1.1.1.3.5 Instructional Activity and Peers
  - 1.1.2 Curricular Design
    - 1.1.2.1 Activities
      - 1.1.2.1.1 Nature of Activities
        - 1.1.2.1.1.1 Manipulative-Exploratory
      - 1.1.2.1.2 Uniformity of Activities
        - 1.1.2.1.2.1 Diverse
    - 1.1.2.2 Time Utilization
      - 1.1.2.2.1 Diffuse
    - 1.1.2.3 Instructional Grouping
      - 1.1.2.3.1 Variability
        - 1.1.2.3.1.1 Heterogeneous with Regard to:
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.1 Age
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.2 Sex
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.3 Developmental Level
      - 1.1.2.3.2 Size
        - 1.1.2.3.2.8 Small Groups and Large Groups
  - 1.1.3 Curricular Responsibility
    - 1.1.3.1 Pre-Instructional
      - 1.1.3.1.1 Generation or Specification of Instructional Materials

1.1.3.1.1.3 Sponsor and Instructors

1.1.3.1.2 Generation or Specification of Instructional Activities

1.1.3.1.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.2 Instructional

1.1.3.2.1 Maintenance of Instructional Interaction

1.1.3.2.1.1 School-based Instructor

1.1.3.2.2 Activity Selection by:

1.1.3.2.2.3 Child and Instructors

1.1.3.3 Post-Instructional

1.1.3.3.1 Formative Evaluation by:

1.1.3.3.1.4 Child and Instructors

1.1.3.3.2 Instructional Prescription by:

1.1.3.3.2.4 Child and Instructors

1.1.4 Curricular Variability

1.1.4.1 Instructional Activities

1.1.4.1.1 Change Daily

1.1.4.2 Time Utilization

1.1.4.2.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.1.4.3 Instructional Grouping

1.1.4.3.1 Changes Daily

1.2 Service Element

1.2.1 Medical

1.2.1.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.2 Dental

1.2.2.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.3 Psychological

1.2.3.3 Preventive as well as Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.4 Health and Nutrition

1.2.4.3 Educational and Meal Program

'2 Instructors

2.1 Instructional Element

2.1.1 Overall Orientation

2.1.1.2 Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor

2.1.2 Means of Instruction

2.1.2.9 Informal Observation and Advising + Presentation of Theory or Teaching Methods

2.1.3 Responsibility for Planning and Facilitating Instruction

2.1.3.1 Sponsor

2.1.4 Formative Evaluation

2.1.4.1 Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.1.2 Based on Implementation Criteria

2.1.4.2 Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.1 Evaluation

2.1.4.2.1.3 Sponsor and Peer Instructors

2.1.4.2.2 Means of Evaluation

2.1.4.2.2.1 Directed Observation

3 Parents

3.1 Instructional Element

3.1.1 Primary Focus

3.1.1.2 Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of the Sponsor's Curriculum

3.2 Participatory Element (Unsalaried)

3.2.1 Primary Focus

3.2.1.3 Community Organization and School Governance as well as Instructional Assistants

3.3 Employment Element

3.3.1 Primary Focus

3.3.1.7 Instructional, Administrative and School-Community Liaison

# # #

EDC Open Education Program

1 Children
- 1.1 Instructional Element
  - 1.1.1 Curricular Orientation
    - 1.1.1.1 Learning Emphasis
      - 1.1.1.1.1 Process
    - 1.1.1.2 Instructional Role
      - 1.1.1.2.1 Interpretive
    - 1.1.1.3 Locus of Reinforcement
      - 1.1.1.3.5 Instructional Activity and Peers
  - 1.1.2 Curricular Design
    - 1.1.2.1 Activities
      - 1.1.2.1.1 Nature of Activities
        - 1.1.2.1.1.1 Manipulative-Exploratory
      - 1.1.2.1.2 Uniformity of Activities
        - 1.1.2.1.2.1 Diverse
    - 1.1.2.2 Time Utilization
      - 1.1.2.2.1 Diffuse
    - 1.1.2.3 Instructional Grouping
      - 1.1.2.3.1 Variability
        - 1.1.2.3.1.1 Heterogeneous in Regard to:
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.1 Age
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.2 Sex
          - 1.1.2.3.1.1.3 Developmental Level
      - 1.1.2.3.2 Size
        - 1.1.2.3.2.14 Alone, Small Groups, Large Groups, Entire Class
  - 1.1.3 Curricular Responsibility
    - 1.1.3.1 Pre-Instructional
      - 1.1.3.1.1 Generation or Specification of Instructional Materials
        - 1.1.3.1.1.2 Instructors

1.1.3.1.2 Generation or Specification of Instructional Activities

1.1.3.1.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.2 Instructional

1.1.3.2.1 Maintenance of Instructional Interaction

1.1.3.2.1.1 School-based Instructor

1.1.3.2.2 Activity Selection by:

1.1.3.3.2.1 Child

1.1.3.3 Post Instructional

1.1.3.3.1 Formative Evaluation by:

1.1.3.3.1.1 Child

1.1.3.3.2 Instructional Prescription by:

1.1.3.3.2.6 Does Not Apply. No Instructional Prescription Made.

1.1.4 Curricular Variability

1.1.4.1 Instructional Activities

1.1.4.1.1 Change Daily

1.1.4.2 Time Utilization

1.1.4.2.6 Does Not Change

1.1.4.3 Instructional Grouping

1.1.4.3.5 No Consistent Pattern

1.2 Service Element

1.2.1 Medical

1.2.1.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.2 Dental

1.2.2.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.3 Psychological

1.2.3.3 Preventive as well as Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.4 Health and Nutrition

1.2.4.3 Educational and Meal Program

2 Instructors

2.1 Instructional Element

2.1.1 Overall Orientation

2.1.1.1 Encouragement of Individual Personal Development

2.1.2 Means of Instruction

2.1.2.3 Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising

2.1.3 Responsibility for Planning and Facilitating Instruction

2.1.3.3 Sponsor and Instructors

2.1.4 Formative Evaluation

2.1.4.1 Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.1.1 Based on Instructor's Perceptions of Classroom Interaction

2.1.4.2 Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.1 Evaluators

2.1.4.2.1.4 No Evaluation by Others

3 Parents

3.1 Instructional Element

3.1.1 Primary Focus

3.1.1.2 Familiarization with the Philosophy and Principles of Sponsor's Curriculum

3.2 Participatory Element (Unsalaried)

3.2.1 Primary Focus

3.2.1.3 Community Organization and School Governance as well as Instructional Assistants

3.3 Employment Element

3.3.1 Primary Focus

3.3.1.7 Instructional, Administrative and School-Community Liaison

# # #

Florida Parent Education Program

1 Children
- 1.1 Instructional Element
  - 1.1.1 Curricular Orientation
    - 1.1.1.1 Learning Emphasis
      - 1.1.1.1.2 Performance
    - 1.1.1.2 Instructional Role
      - 1.1.1.2.2 Regulated
    - 1.1.1.3 Locus of Reinforcement
      - 1.1.1.3.2 Instructors
  - 1.1.2 Curricular Design
    - 1.1.2.1 Activities
      - 1.1.2.1.1 Nature of Activities
        - 1.1.2.1.1.1 Manipulative-Exploratory
      - 1.1.2.1.2 Uniformity of Activities
        - 1.1.2.1.2.1 Diverse
    - 1.1.2.2 Time Utilization
      - 1.1.2.2.2 Concentrated
    - 1.1.2.3 Instructional Grouping[4]
      - 1.1.2.3.2 Size
        - 1.1.2.3.2.1 Child Works Alone
  - 1.1.3 Curricular Responsibility
    - 1.1.3.1 Pre Instructional
      - 1.1.3.1.1 Generation or Specification of Instructional Materials
        - 1.1.3.1.1.3 Sponsor and Instructors
      - 1.1.3.1.2 Generation or Specification of Instructional Activities
        - 1.1.3.1.2.3 Sponsor and Instructors
    - 1.1.3.2 Instructional
      - 1.1.3.2.1 Maintenance of Instructional Interaction
        - 1.1.3.2.1.2 Home-based Parent
      - 1.1.3.2.2 Instructors

1.1.3.3 Post Instructional

1.1.3.3.1 Formative Evaluation by:

1.1.3.3.2.3 Sponsor

1.1.3.3.2 Instructional Prescription by:

1.1.3.3.2.3 Sponsor

1.1.4 Curricular Variability

1.1.4.1 Instructional Activities

1.1.4.1.2 Change Weekly

1.1.4.2 Time Utilization

1.1.4.3.6 Does Not Change

1.1.4.3 Instructional Grouping

1.1.4.3.6 Does Not Change

1.2 Service Element

1.2.1 Medical

1.2.1.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.2 Dental

1.2.2.1 Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.3 Psychological

1.2.3.3 Prevention as well as Examination and Referral or Treatment

1.2.4 Health and Nutrition

1.2.4.3 Educational and Meal Program

2 Instructors[5]

2.1 Instructional Element

2.1.1 Overall Orientation

2.1.1.3 Internalization of Behaviorally Specified Responses to Instructional Contingencies

2.1.2 Means of Instruction

2.1.2.3 Informal Sponsor Observation and Advising

2.1.3 Responsibility for Planning and Facilitating Instruction

2.1.3.1 Sponsor

2.1.4 Formative Evaluation

2.1.4.2 Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.1.3 No Self-Evaluation

2.1.4.2 Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.1 Evaluation by Others

2.1.4.2.1.1 Sponsor

2.1.4.2.2 Means of Evaluation

2.1.4.2.2.1 Directed Observation

3 Parents

3.1 Instructional Element

3.1.1 Primary Focus

3.1.1.5 Concentration on the Parent-Child Interaction + Social Change and Community Action Skills

3.2 Participatory Element (Unsalaried)

3.2.1 Primary Focus

3.2.1.2 Community Organization and School Governance

3.3 Employment Element

3.2.1 Primary Focus

3.2.1.7 Instructional, Administrative and School-Community Liaison

# # #

FOOTNOTES

[1]Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, Section 222(a). Now superceded by the Community Services Act of 1974, PL-93-644.

[2]Richard F. Elmore, "Design of the Follow Through Experiment," in Planned Variation in Education: Should We Give Up or Try Harder?, eds.: Alice M. Rivlin and P. Michael Timpane (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1975), p. 29ff.

[3]The Hampton Institute Nongraded Model sponsored by The Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia 23368; Dr. Mary Christian, Director.

[4]Since the Florida Parent Education Program concentrates on teaching the parent to instruct the child, some of the categories of this typology accommodate the model awkwardly. Category 1.1.2.2.1, Variability of Instructional Grouping, is a case in point. Since the instructional group consists of the child and a parent, the notion of Homogeneity or Heterogeneity are not relevant, and thus have been omitted from the characterization of the program approach.

[5]The category of Instructors refers to parents who teach their children the tasks assigned by the Parent Educator. Parent Educators are considered to be the sponsor's representatives, and instruction of the parent instructor generally occurs during a home visit by the Parent Educator.